

Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 065070

10

ORIGIN SS-10

INFO OCT-01 ADP-00 /011 R

66660

DRAFTED BY: PM/ DCA: TWSIMONS, JR

APPROVED BY: D/ MBFR: MR. BAKER

S/ S- O: RWRIGHT

----- 006833

R 060637 Z APR 73

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO USMISSION NATO

S E C R E T STATE 065070

EXDIS

E. O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

FOLLOWING SENT ACTION SECSTATE SECDEF MARCH 31, FROM VIENNA
REPEATED TO YOU QUOTE:

S E C R E T VIENNA 2621

EXDIS

NOFORN

FROM US MBFR REP

I. O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: MBFR: MARCH 30 DISCUSSION WITH SOVIET REP ON HUNGARIAN
ISSUE

1. BEGIN SUMMARY. US REP MET WITH SOVIET REP KVITSINSKIY AT
LATTER' S REQUEST ON EVENING OF MARCH 30. KVITSINSKIY SAID HE
HAD RECEIVED INSTRUCTIONS FROM MOSCOW AND PROCEEDED TO DEVELOP
A TEXT OF THE PROCEDURES PAPER ALONG THE LINES OF THE ALLIED
SECRET

PAGE 02 STATE 065070

PAPER OF FEB 8 WITH HUNGARY IN THE CATEGORY OF SPECIAL PARTICI-
PANT AND AN ENLARGEMENT CLAUSE. KVITSINSKIY STATED HE HAD BEEN
REBUFFED BY MOSCOW AS REGARDS AN EXCHANGE OF UNILATERAL

STATEMENTS AND HE DID NOT BELIEVE IT PRODUCTIVE TO FOLLOW THAT COURSE FURTHER. US REP TOLD KVITSINSKIY THAT IN HIS ESTIMATION IT WOULD BE POLITICALLY IMPOSSIBLE TO GET SUCH A PACKAGE THROUGH. KVITSINSKIY REQUESTED IT BE REFERRED TO WASHINGTON IN ANY CASE. US REP RELUCTANTLY AGREED, BUT FORECAST REJECTION.

2. ACTION REQUESTED: GUIDANCE BY 0900 LOCAL TIME, SUNDAY, APRIL 1, TO AMEND PROPOSED COURSE OF ACTION DESCRIBED IN PARAGRAPH 14 BELOW. END SUMMARY.

3. KVITSINSKIY REQUESTED INTERVIEW WITH US REP MARCH 30. HE TOLD US REP HE HAD RECEIVED INSTRUCTIONS FROM MOSCOW THE PRECEDING EVENING ON THE PROPOSALS REGARDING PROCEDURES AND PARTICIPATION HE HAD RECENTLY FORWARDED. READING FROM A TYPED ENGLISH TEXT, KVITSINSKIY PROCEEDED TO DEVELOP THE TEXT OF A PROCEDURES PAPER (SET FORTH BELOW) ALONG THE LINES OF THE ALLIED PAPER OF FEB 8, BUT WITH HUNGARY LISTED IN THE SPECIAL CATEGORY. THE TEXT ALSO CONTAINS AN ADDITION IN REGARD TO DECISION-MAKING FORESHADOWED BY EARLIER SOVIET COMMENTS AND AN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA, THE WORDING OF WHICH KVITSINSKIY STATED WAS BASED ON DISCUSSION OF THIS SUBJECT IN THE QUADRILATERAL DISCUSSIONS WITH THE NETHERLANDS AND HUNGARY AND ON HIS OWN PAST DISCUSSIONS WITH US REP.

4. BEGIN TEXT.

(1) REPRESENTATIVES OF THE FOLLOWING STATES ARE PARTICIPATING IN THE PREPARATORY CONSULTATIONS WHICH BEGAN IN VIENNA ON 31 JAN 1973: (ALPHABETICAL LIST OF 19 PARTICIPANTS).

(2) THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE FOLLOWING STATES, WHICH ARE POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS IN POSSIBLE MEASURES RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE, WILL TAKE THE NECESSARY DECISIONS BY CONSENSUS: (LIST OF 11). IF ANOTHER STATE WISHES TO BE INCLUDED AMONG THE STATES LISTED IN PARA 2 AND THIS IS AGREED BY CONSENSUS OF PARTICIPANTS IN PARA 2, IT MAY BE SO INCLUDED. SUCH INCLUSION IN NEGOTIATIONS OR DECISIONS RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE COULD EITHER BE GENERAL OR, IF SO AGREED, COULD BE FOR THE LIMITED PURPOSE OF TAKING PART IN A PARTICULAR DECISION OR DECISIONS
SECRET

PAGE 03 STATE 065070

RELATED TO THIS SUBJECT. IT IS UNDERSTOOD THAT SUCH ADDITIONAL PARTICIPATION WOULD BE WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO THE SECURITY OF ANY PARTY.

(3) THE FOLLOWING STATES WILL PARTICIPATE IN A CONSULTATIVE STATUS: (LIST OF EIGHT INCLUDING HUNGARY).

(4) ALL PARTICIPANTS WILL BE SEATED IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER ACCORDING TO THE ENGLISH ALPHABET.

(5) THE CHAIRMANSHIP WILL ROTATE FROM MEETING TO MEETING AMONG THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATES LISTED IN PARA 2 IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER. THE FIRST CHAIRMAN WILL BE DRAWN BY LOT.

(6.) ALL PARTICIPANTS WILL HAVE THE RIGHT TO SPEAK AND TO CIRCULATE PAPERS ON THE SUBJECT MATTER.

(7) THE MEETINGS WILL BE OPEN ONLY TO THE PARTICIPANTS.

(8) FOLLOWING THE OPENING STATEMENTS, PROCEEDINGS AND DOCUMENTS OF THE MEETINGS WILL BE CONFIDENTIAL EXCEPT FOR THOSE MATTERS ON WHICH IT IS AGREED IN ADVANCE THAT ANOTHER PROCEDURE WILL BE FOLLOWED. THERE WILL BE NO OFFICIAL RECORDS OF MEETINGS.

(9) THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGES WILL BE ENGLISH, FRENCH, GERMAN AND RUSSIAN.

END TEXT.

5. COMMENTING ON VARIOUS POINTS OF THE TEXT, WHICH HE SAID HAD BEEN APPROVED IN FULL BY MOSCOW, KVITSINSKIY SAID MOSCOW WOULD PREFER TO HAVE THE WORDING, " POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS IN REDUCTIONS OF FORCES AND AGREEMENTS IN CENTRAL EUROPE," INSTEAD OF THE PRESENT WORDING, " POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS IN POSSIBLE MEASURES RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE," IN PARA 2 BECAUSE IT WISHED TO HAVE AS SPECIFIC A FORMULA AS POSSIBLE. US REP POINTED OUT THAT HE WAS UNCERTAIN THAT EVEN THE PRESENT FORMULA WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE. TO HAVE LANGUAGE OF THE TYPE NOW PROPOSED BY KVITSINSKIY WOULD ANTICIPATE LATER DISCUSSION ON THE AGENDA AS REGARDS THE DESIGNATION OF THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THE PENDING NEGOTIATIONS. AND HE WOULD STRONGLY ADVISE AGAINST PUSHING THIS POINT. KVITSINSKIY SAID HE HAD MADE THIS CLEAR TO MOSCOW ALREADY,
SECRET

PAGE 04 STATE 065070

WHICH WAS THE REASON THEY HAD COME ALONG WITH THE PRESENT FORMULA, BUT THEY STILL WANTED MORE. US REP SAID IT WOULD BE EXTREMELY TIME CONSUMING TO TRY TO FIND A BROADER FORMULA AT THIS TIME.

6. US REP SAID WITH REGARD TO THE PROPOSED ENLARGEMENT FORMULA THAT NONE OF THE ALLIES SAW ANY REAL NEED FOR SUCH A FORMULA. SOME DID NOT LIKE IT AT ALL. MANY CONSIDERED THAT IT WOULD, IN ADDITION, CREATE FRICTION WITH FRANCE. KVITSINSKIY REPLIED THAT THE FRENCH SEEMED TO HAVE CHANGED THEIR POSITION SOMEWHAT. IN RECENT DISCUSSIONS WITH SOVIET REPRESENTATIVES, THEY HAD SHOWN MORE FLEXIBILITY AND HAD INDICATED THAT THEIR PARTICIPATION IN MBFR NEGOTIATIONS WOULD DEPEND ON THE ACTUAL FORM THE NEGOTIATIONS TOOK AS REGARDS THE AREA AND TYPES OF FORCES INVOLVED, AND OTHER PRACTICAL DETAILS. HE DID NOT BELIEVE THE FRENCH WOULD TAKE A NEGATIVE VIEW OF THE PRESENT LANGUAGE. US REP POINTED OUT THAT PARA 6 OF THE SOVIET TEXT BLURRED THE DISTINCTION-

TION CONTAINED IN THE ALLIED PAPER OF FEB 8 BETWEEN DIRECT AND SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS. KVITSINSKIY POINTED OUT THAT THE DISTINCTION WAS CLEARLY SYMBOLIZED BY CONFINING THE CHAIRMANSHIP TO THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS.

7. US REP ASKED WHETHER THE SOVIETS WOULD BE READY TO INCLUDE A PARAGRAPH CARRYING OVER TO THE NEGOTIATION PARTICIPATION ARRANGMENTS WHICH MIGHT BE AGREED ON IN THIS SESSION AS HAD BEEN SUGGESTED BY THE NETHERLANDS REP IN THE MARCH 13 SESSION WITH THE SOVIETS AND HUNGARIANS, OR PERHAPS THE NETIRE PROCEDURES PAPER COULD BE TAKEN OVER. KVITSINSKIY INDICATED THE SOVIETS MIGHT BE WILLING TO HAVE SOME LANGUAGE WHICH INDICATED THAT THE PRESENT PATTERN OF PARTICIPATION MIGHT BE CARRIED OVER TO THE NEGOTIATIONS, BUT THEY WOULD NOT WANT TO MAKE THIS EXCLUSIVE BECAUSE THEY WISH TO LEAVE OPEN THE POSSIBILITY THAT ADDITIONAL STATES MIGHT BE INVITED AS SIMPLE OBSERVERS. US REP SAID THIS WOULD ANTICIPATE A SUBJECT WHICH MIGHT BE DISCUSSED LATER IF THE SOVIETS INSISTED BUT SHOULD NOT BE REFLECTED IN THE PRESENT PROCEDURES PAPER. KVITSINSKIY SAID THE SOVIETS WOULD BE WILLING TO DISCUSS THIS ISSUE AT A LATER POINT.

8. US REP ASKED KVITSINSKIY ABOUT MOSCOW'S REACTION TO THE COMPLEMENTARY UNILATERAL STATEMENTS WHOSE MAIN CONCEPTS HAD BEEN DEVELOPED IN RECENT QUADRILATERAL MEETINGS. KVITSINSKIY SAID THAT HE HAD SENT IN A POSSIBLE TEXT BASED ON THE CON-
SECRET

PAGE 05 STATE 065070

CEPTS ADVANCED BY THE ALLIED REPS IN THOSE MEETINGS BUT HIS RECOMMENDATIONS HAD NOW BEEN TURNED DOWN WITH A CURT SENTENCE WHICH HE READ OUT FROM A NOTEBOOK, " ALLIED PROPOSALS IN THEIR PRESENT WORDING ARE UNACCEPTABLE."

9. US REP SAID THAT THIS REACTION WAS UNFORTUNATE BUT WAS CLEARLY NOT A REJECTION IN PRINCIPLE OF UNILATERAL STATEMENTS.

KVITSINSKIY SAID THAT TO THE DEGREE HE WAS ACQUAINTED WITH MOSCOW ATTITUDES, HE WOULD STRONGLY ADVISE AGAINST PURSUING THE MATTER FURTHER. THE ONLY STATEMENT MOSCOW HAD IN MIND WAS THE ONE HE HAD EARLIER MENTIONED TO THE US REP TO THE EFFECT THAT, " THE WESTERN PARTICIPANTS CONSIDER THE PARTICIPATION OF HUNGARY IN MEASURES RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE A MATTER OF DIRECT INTEREST TO THEIR OWN SECURITY." (PARA 4 VIENNA 2279(US REP HAD ALREADY TOLD HIM THIS WOULD BE UNSATISFACTORY. BUT HE BELIEVED THAT IF ALLIES INSISTED ON GOING FURTHER, THAN THIS IN STATEMENTS, MOSCOW WOULD CATEGORICALLY INSIST ON REPLYING WITH A STATEMENT OF ITS OWN TO THE EFFECT THAT THE ALLIED STATEMENT WAS NOT BINDING.

10. US REP SAID THAT AS HE WOULD PERSONALLY EVALUATE THE OVERALL SITUATION IN THE WEST, HE WOULD CONSIDER IT IMPOSSIBLE TO GET THE SOVIET PACKAGE THROUGH. THE SOVIET PROPOSAL NOT ONLY

PLACED HUNGARY IN THE CATEGORY OF SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS, BUT INCLUDED AN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA WHICH SERVED SOVIET INTERESTS, WHILE ELIMINATING STATEMENTS WHICH SERVED ALLIED INTERESTS. IT WAS THUS WHOLLY TO THE UNILATERAL ADVANTAGE OF THE SOVIETS.

11. KVITSINSKIY REPLIED THAT THE SITUATION WAS NOT AS BAD AS THIS. THE ENLARGEMENT PARAGRAPH HE HAD PROPOSED CONTAINED MOSCOW'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT IN WRITTEN FORM THAT THE HUNGARIAN ISSUE WOULD IN FACT COME UP IN NEGOTIATIONS AND WOULD HAVE TO BE NEGOTIATED ON AT THAT TIME, AND THAT THIS WAS UN-AVOIDABLE. MOREOVER, THE ALLIES COULD INTERPRET THIS FORMULA AS THEY WANTED IN THEIR OWN COMMENTS TO THE WESTERN PRESS, OR MIGHT EVEN MENTION THEIR VIEWS IN THEIR OPENING STATEMENTS.

12. US REP SAID SUCH STEPS WOULD NOT TAKE THE PLACE OF AUTHORITY STATEMENTS IN THE TEXT. IT WAS A NEGATIVE STEP TO LIST HUNGARY AS A SPECIAL PARTICIPANT, WHICH WOULD ACTUALLY PREJUDGE THE OUTCOME OF ANY SUCH DISCUSSION. HE HAD TRIED TO MAKE CLEAR
SECRET

PAGE 06 STATE 065070

THAT IF HUNGARY WERE NOT TO APPEAR IN THE LIST OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, THERE WOULD HAVE TO BE SOME EXPLANATORY LANGUAGE IN THE TEXT SUCH AS THE STATEMENTS THE ALLIES HAD PROPOSED. KVITSINSKIY REPLIED THAT HE WAS SORRY THAT HIS RECOMMENDATION HAD NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY MOSCOW. US REP AGAIN POINTED OUT THAT THE LANGUAGE KVITSINSKIY HAD USED DID NOT MEAN MOSCOW WOULD REJECT ALL STATEMENTS. KVITSINSKIY ANSWERED THAT THIS WAS CORRECT, BUT THAT ALTHOUGH HE HAD RECEIVED NO INSTRUCTIONS, HE WAS CONVINCED MOSCOW WOULD NOT ACCEPT ANYTHING WHICH WENT BEYOND THE FORMULA HE HAD EARLIER MENTIONED.

13. US REP SAID THIS WOULD NOT BE SUFFICIENT. HE REGRETTED HAVING TO MAKE SUCH AN ASSESSMENT, BUT HE HAD TO SAY HE SAW NO WAY OUT OF THE PRESENT IMPASSE. KVITSINSKIY URGED THE US REP NONETHELESS TO SEND IN THE SOVIET TEXT TO WASHINGTON. US REP QUESTIONED THE VALUE OF SUCH AN ACTION UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES. KVITSINSKIY REMINDED US REP THAT HE HAD FORWARDED LATTER'S ASSESSMENT OF THE SITUATION TO MOSCOW DESPITE FOREKNOWLEDGE THAT IT WOULD BE UNPALATABLE. US REP AGREED TO REPORT SOVIET TEXT BUT SAID HE SAW NO PROSPECTS OF ACCEPTANCE. KVITSINSKIY SAID THAT IF US REP COULD SEND IN THE TEXT AND COULD GET SOME NEW GUIDANCE ON IT FROM WASHINGTON, HE WOULD MAKE A SPECIAL TRIP TO BRATISLAVA WHERE SOVIET SECURE VOICE COMMUNICATIONS ARE LOCATED, REPORT THE OUTCOME TO MOSCOW, AND TRY TO GET A RESPONSE BY THE EVENING OF APRIL 2. HE REQUESTED THAT HE GET SOME INDICATIONS OF US VIEWS BY THE MORNING OF APRIL 1.

14. RECOMMENDED ACTION: UNLESS DEPARTMENT RECEIVES OBJECTIONS, US REP INTENDS TO TAKE LINE WITH KVITSINSKIY THAT HE HAS REPORTED KVITSINSKIY'S REMARKS AND SOVIET TEXT TO THE DEPARTMENT. HE WOULD CONTINUE THAT HIS READING OF THE SITUATION IN THE DEPART-

MENT IS THAT LATTER WOULD BE UNWILLING TO CONSIDER A SOLUTION WHICH DID NOT MAKE CLEAR THAT THE POSSIBLE INCLUSION OF HUNGARY IN AGREED MEASURES WAS OPEN FOR LATER DECISION, CONATINED AN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA WHICH MAINLY SERVED SOVIET INTERESTS, AND MADE NO PROVISION FOR AN UNCONTESTED UNILATERAL STATEMENT. IN HIS VIEW, THE SITUATION MIGHT BE CHANGED IF THE SOVIETS WERE WILLING TO ACCEPT BOTH A CHANGE IN THE TEXT OF THE POSSIBLE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA IN PARA 2 OF THE SOVIET PAPER TO INCLUDE THE PHRASE " WITH FORCES OR TERRITORIES IN CENTRAL EUROPE" AFTER THE PHRASE " IF ANOTHER STATE" AND TO AGREE THAT THERE SHOULD BE AN UNCOTESTED UNILATERAL ALLIED STATEMENT

SECRET

PAGE 07 STATE 065070

ALONG THE LINES OF THE SECOND AND FOURTH CONCEPTS ADVANCED BY THE ALLIED REPS ON MARCH 28. IN VIES OF THE SENSITIVITIES SHOWN BY THE HUNGARIANS, WE MIGHT BE WILLING TO CONSIDER DROPPING THE IDEA OF A STATEMENT FROM HUNGARY, THOUGH THE INCLUSION OF SUCH A STATEMENT WOULD CONSIDERABLY IMPROVE THE CHANGES OF ACCEPTANCE OF THE OVERALL PACKAGE. AS REGARDS OTHER ASPECTS OF THE SOVIET PAPER, HE WOULD RETURN TO THEM AT A LATER POINT, EXCEPT T PPOINT OUT THAT IF THERE IS TO BE AN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA, WE DO NOT LIKE THE LAST SENTENCE OF THE PRESENT ONE.

15. SUCH AN APPROACH MIGHT IN THEORY RESULT IN SOVIET ACCEPTANCE EITHER OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA DRAWN FROM PARA 2 C OF STATE 58599 OR OF THE UNILATERAL STATEMENT. IF WASHINGTON PREFERS A DIFFERENT OR MORE DETAILED APPROACH THAN THAT SUGGESTED ABOVE, WE COULD WAIT WITH OUR REACTION. HOWEVER, KVITSINSKIY APPEARS READY TO GO ALONG WITH A CERTAIN URGENCY OF APPROACH AND IT WOULD BE DESIRABLE TO UTILIZE WHATEVER MOMENTUM THERE MAY BE ON THIS ISSUE IN MOSCOW AND AT LEAST GET A CLEAR AND RAPID ANSWER EVEN IF IT IS NEGATIVE.

16. WITH REGARD TO POINTS RAISED IN STATE 58599, WHICH CAN NOW BE COMPARED WITH LATEST SOVIET POSITION GIVEN BY KVITSINSKIY, OF THE TWO POSSIBILITIES, WE BELIEVE A UNILATERAL ALLIED STATEMENT WOULD CARRY CONSIDERABLY MORE WEIGHT WITH THE ALLIES IF WE COULD GET SOMETHING LIKE OUR PRESENT WORDING THAT AN AMENDED ENLARGEMENT FORMULA REFERRING TO STATES WITH FORCES OR TERRITORY IN CENTRAL EUROPE. WE DO NOT BELIEVE, GIVEN THE OVERALL CIRCUMSTANCES, THAT AN OUTCOME WILL BE FEASIBLE WHICH WOULD NOT INDICATE THAT HUNGARY WAS A SPECIAL PARTICIPANT. WE BELIEVE THE ALLIES MIGHT CONSIDER THE DEVICE OF NOT ACTUALLY LISTING THE SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS, AS SUGGESTED IN PARA 2 B OF STATE 58599, A RATHER UNCONVINCING DEVICE, ALTHOUGH IT MIGHT BE RAISED LATER WITH SOVIETS.

17. IN LATER DISCUSSION OF FULL TEXT WITH SOVIET WE COULD PROBABLY GAIN ACCEPTANCE OF INSERTION OF THE PHRASE " RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE" AFTER " CONSULTATIONS" IN PARA 1. WE MIGHT GIAN ACCEPTANCE OF REFERNCE TO STATES WHICH HAVE TROOPS OR

TERRITORY IN ENCTRAL EUROPE IN PARA 2, BUT THIS WOULD BE
DIFFICULT AND WOULD IN ADDITION RUN CONSIDERABLE RISK OF
INCREASING SOVIET DESIRE TO EXPAND THE PARAGRAPH FURTHER BY
BRINGING IN REFERENCE TO REDUCTION OF FORCES AND ARMAMENTS.
SECRET

PAGE 08 STATE 065070

THUS WOULD BE INCLINED TO RECOMMEND AGAINST IT. IN ANY EVENT,
PHRASE SHOULD PROBABLY BE " AMONG THOSE STATES HAVING FORCES
OR TERRITORY IN CENTRAL UUROPE" IN ORDER TO WORK AGAINST
POSSIBLE EASTERN CLAIM THAT THE LIST IS A COMPLETE LISTING
OF SUCH STATESZN A CLAIM WHICH MIGHT HAVE NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES
IF HUNGARY WERE TO BE LISTED AMONG SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS.
LAST SENTENCE OF SOVIET ENLRGEMENT FORMULA IN PARA 2 OF THEIR
PAPER WOULD SEEM PREJUDICIAL TO OUR INTERESTS SINCE IT
PLACES BURDEN ON THOSE PROPOSING ADDITIONAL PARTICIPANTS TO
PROVE THAT THE ADDITION IS WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO THE SECURITY
OF OTHERS INCLUDING OTHER DIRECT PARTICIPANTS AND WOULD HAVE
TO BE REWORKED. WE DO NOT THINK NEW SOVIET PARA 6 ON RIGHT TO
SPEAK WORTH OPPOSING. ALLIED FLANKS MIGHT APPROVE IT; OTHER
ALLIES MIGHT CONSIDER IT NOT WORTH OPPOSING. HUMES UNQUOTE
ROGERS

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 07 MAY 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 06 APR 1973
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: boyleja
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973STATE065070
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: PM/ DCA: TWSIMONS, JR
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730460/abqceige.tel
Line Count: 351
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ORIGIN SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS NOFORN
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 7
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS NOFORN
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: boyleja
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 03 AUG 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <03-Aug-2001 by boyleja>; APPROVED <17-Sep-2001 by boyleja>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: <DBA CORRECTED> gwr 971205
Subject: MBFR: MARCH 30 DISCUSSION WITH SOVIET REP ON HUNGARIAN ISSUE
TAGS: PARM, XG, NATO
To: NATO
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005